

A NOTE ON PÓLYA'S OBSERVATION CONCERNING LIOUVILLE'S FUNCTION

RICHARD P. BRENT AND JAN VAN DE LUNE

*Dedicated to Herman J. J. te Riele on the occasion of his retirement from the
CWI in January 2012*

ABSTRACT. We show that a certain weighted mean of the Liouville function $\lambda(n)$ is negative. In this sense, we can say that the Liouville function is negative “on average”.

1. INTRODUCTION

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $n = \prod_{p|n} p^{e_p(n)}$ be the canonical prime factorization of n and let $\Omega(n) := \sum_{p|n} e_p(n)$. Here (as always in this paper) p is prime. Thus, $\Omega(n)$ is the total number of prime factors of n , counting multiplicities. For example: $\Omega(1) = 0$, $\Omega(2) = 1$, $\Omega(4) = 2$, $\Omega(6) = 2$, $\Omega(8) = 3$, $\Omega(16) = 4$, $\Omega(60) = 4$, etc.

Define Liouville's multiplicative function $\lambda(n) = (-1)^{\Omega(n)}$. For example $\lambda(1) = 1$, $\lambda(2) = -1$, $\lambda(4) = 1$, etc. The Möbius function $\mu(n)$ may be defined to be $\lambda(n)$ if n is square-free, and 0 otherwise.

It is well-known, and follows easily from the Euler product for the Riemann zeta-function $\zeta(s)$, that $\lambda(n)$ has the Dirichlet generating function

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda(n)}{n^s} = \frac{\zeta(2s)}{\zeta(s)}$$

for $\operatorname{Re}(s) > 1$. This provides an alternative definition of $\lambda(n)$.

Let $L(n) := \sum_{k \leq n} \lambda(k)$ be the summatory function of the Liouville function; similarly $M(n) := \sum_{k \leq n} \mu(k)$ for the Möbius function.

The topic of this note is closely related to Pólya's conjecture [12, 1919] that $L(n) \leq 0$ for $n \geq 2$.

Pólya verified this for $n \leq 1500$ and Lehmer [9, 1956] checked it for $n \leq 600\,000$. However, Ingham [5, 1942] cast doubt on the plausibility of Pólya's conjecture by showing that it would imply not only the Riemann Hypothesis and simplicity of the zeros of $\zeta(s)$, but also the linear dependence over the rationals of the imaginary parts of the zeros

ρ of $\zeta(s)$ in the upper half-plane. Ingham cast similar doubt on the Mertens conjecture $|M(n)| \leq \sqrt{n}$, which was subsequently disproved in a remarkable *tour de force* by Odlyzko and te Riele [11, 1985]. More recent results and improved bounds were given by Kotnik and te Riele [7, 2006]; see also Kotnik and van de Lune [6, 2004].

In view of Ingham's results, it was no surprise when Haselgrove showed [2, 1958] that Pólya's conjecture is false. He did not give an explicit counter-example, but his proof suggested that $L(u)$ might be positive in the vicinity of $u \approx 1.8474 \times 10^{361}$.

Sherman Lehman [8, 1960] gave an algorithm for calculating $L(n)$ similar to Meissel's [10, 1885] formula for the prime-counting function $\pi(x)$, and found the counter-example $L(906\,180\,359) = +1$.

Tanaka [14, 1980] found the smallest counter-example $L(n) = +1$ for $n = 906\,150\,257$. Walter M. Lioen and Jan van de Lune [*circa* 1994] scanned the range $n \leq 2.5 \times 10^{11}$ using a fast sieve, but found no counter-examples beyond those of Tanaka. More recently, Borwein, Ferguson and Mossinghoff [1, 2008] showed that $L(n) = +1\,160\,327$ for $n = 351\,753\,358\,289\,465$.

Humphries [3, 4] showed that, under certain plausible but unproved hypotheses (including the Riemann Hypothesis), there is a limiting logarithmic distribution of $L(n)/\sqrt{n}$, and numerical computations show that the logarithmic density of the set $\{n \in \mathbb{N} | L(n) < 0\}$ is approximately 0.99988. Humphries' approach followed that of Rubinstein and Sarnak [13], who investigated "Chebyshev's bias" in prime "races".

Here we show in an elementary manner, and without any unproved hypotheses, that $\lambda(n)$ is (in a certain sense) "negative on average". To prove this, all that we need are some well-known facts about Mellin transforms, and the functional equation for the Jacobi theta function (which may be proved using Poisson summation). Our main result is:

Theorem 1. *There exists a positive constant c such that for every (fixed) $N \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda(n)}{e^{n\pi x} + 1} = -\frac{c}{\sqrt{x}} + \frac{1}{2} + O(x^N) \quad \text{as } x \downarrow 0.$$

Thus, a weighted mean of $\{\lambda(n)\}$, with positive weights initially close to a constant $(1/2)$ and becoming small for $n \gg 1/x$, is negative for $x < x_0$ and tends to $-\infty$ as $x \downarrow 0$.

In the final section we mention some easy results on the Möbius function $\mu(n)$ to contrast its behaviour with that of $\lambda(n)$.

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

We prove Theorem 1 in three steps.

Step 1. For $x > 0$,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda(n)}{e^{n\pi x} - 1} = \phi(x) = \frac{\theta(x) - 1}{2},$$

where

$$\phi(x) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{-k^2\pi x}, \quad \theta(x) := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-k^2\pi x}.$$

Step 2. For $x > 0$,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda(n)}{e^{n\pi x} + 1} = \phi(x) - 2\phi(2x).$$

Step 3. Theorem 1 now follows from the functional equation

$$\theta(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}} \theta\left(\frac{1}{x}\right)$$

for the Jacobi theta function $\theta(x)$.

Proof of Theorem 1.

(1) In the following, we assume that $\operatorname{Re}(s) > 1$, so the Dirichlet series and integrals are absolutely convergent, and interchanging the orders of summation and integration is easy to justify.

As mentioned above, it is well-known that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda(n)}{n^s} = \prod_p (1 + p^{-s})^{-1} = \prod_p \frac{1 - p^{-s}}{1 - p^{-2s}} = \frac{\zeta(2s)}{\zeta(s)}.$$

Define

$$f(x) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda(n)}{e^{nx} - 1}, \quad (x > 0).$$

We will use the well known fact that if two sufficiently well-behaved functions (such as ours below) have the same Mellin transform then the functions are equal.

The Mellin transform of $f(x)$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
 F(s) &:= \int_0^\infty f(x)x^{s-1} dx = \int_0^\infty \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{\lambda(n)}{e^{nx} - 1} x^{s-1} dx \\
 &= \sum_{n=1}^\infty \lambda(n) \int_0^\infty \frac{x^{s-1}}{e^{nx} - 1} dx = \left(\sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{\lambda(n)}{n^s} \right) \times \int_0^\infty \frac{x^{s-1}}{e^x - 1} dx \\
 &= \frac{\zeta(2s)}{\zeta(s)} \times \zeta(s)\Gamma(s) = \zeta(2s)\Gamma(s).
 \end{aligned}$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_0^\infty \phi\left(\frac{x}{\pi}\right) x^{s-1} dx &= \int_0^\infty \left(\sum_{n=1}^\infty e^{-n^2 x} \right) x^{s-1} dx \\
 &= \left(\sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{n^{2s}} \right) \times \int_0^\infty e^{-x} x^{s-1} dx = \zeta(2s)\Gamma(s),
 \end{aligned}$$

so the Mellin transforms of $f(x)$ and of $\phi(x/\pi)$ are identical. Thus $f(x) = \phi(x/\pi)$. Replacing x by πx , we see that

$$\sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{\lambda(n)}{e^{n\pi x} - 1} = \sum_{k=1}^\infty e^{-k^2 \pi x},$$

completing the proof of step (1).

(2) Observe that

$$\frac{1}{e^{n\pi x} + 1} = \frac{1}{e^{n\pi x} - 1} - \frac{2}{e^{2n\pi x} - 1},$$

so, from step (1),

$$\sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{\lambda(n)}{e^{n\pi x} + 1} = \phi(x) - 2\phi(2x).$$

(3) Using the functional equation for $\theta(x)$, we easily find that

$$\phi(x) - 2\phi(2x) = -\frac{c}{\sqrt{x}} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}} \left(\phi\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) - \sqrt{2} \phi\left(\frac{1}{2x}\right) \right)$$

with $c = (\sqrt{2} - 1)/2 > 0$, proving our claim, since the “error” term is bounded by $\phi(1/x)/\sqrt{x} \sim \exp(-\pi/x)/\sqrt{x} = O(x^N)$ as $x \downarrow 0$ (for any fixed exponent N). \square

3. REMARKS ON THE MÖBIUS FUNCTION

We give some further applications of the identity

$$(*) \quad \frac{1}{z+1} = \frac{1}{z-1} - \frac{2}{z^2-1}$$

that we used (with $z = e^{n\pi x}$) in proving step (2) above.

Lemma 2. *For $|x| < 1$, we have*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(n) \frac{x^n}{x^n + 1} = x - 2x^2.$$

Proof. Assume that $|x| < 1$. It is well known that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(n) \frac{x^n}{1 - x^n} = x,$$

in fact this “Lambert series” identity is equivalent to the Dirichlet series identity $\sum \mu(n)/n^s = 1/\zeta(s)$. Writing $y = 1/x$, we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)}{y^n - 1} = 1/y.$$

It follows on taking $z = y^n$ in our identity (*) that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)}{y^n + 1} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)}{y^n - 1} - 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)}{y^{2n} - 1} = y^{-1} - 2y^{-2}.$$

Replacing y by $1/x$ gives the result. \square

Corollary 3.

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)}{2^n + 1} = 0.$$

Proof. Take $x = 1/2$ in Lemma 2. \square

It follows from Lemma 2 that

$$\lim_{x \uparrow 1} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(n) \frac{x^n}{x^n + 1} = -1,$$

so that one might say that in this sense $\mu(n)$ is negative on average. However, this is much weaker than what we showed in Theorem 1 for $L(n)$, where the corresponding sum tends to $-\infty$. The “complex-analytic” reason for this difference is that $\zeta(2s)/\zeta(s)$ has a pole (with negative residue) at $s = 1/2$, but $1/\zeta(s)$ is regular at $s = 1$.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. BORWEIN, R. FERGUSON AND M. J. MOSSINGHOFF, *Sign changes in sums of the Liouville function*, Math. Comp. **77** (2008), 1681–1694.
- [2] C. B. HASELGROVE, *A disproof of a conjecture of Pólya*, Mathematika **5** (1958), 141–145.
- [3] P. B. HUMPHRIES, *The Summatory Function of Liouville's Function and Pólya's Conjecture*, Honours Thesis, Department of Mathematics, The Australian National University, Canberra, October 2010.
- [4] P. B. HUMPHRIES, *The Distribution of Weighted Sums of the Liouville's Function and Pólya's Conjecture*, arXiv:1108.1524, August 2011.
- [5] A. E. INGHAM, *On two conjectures in the theory of numbers*, Amer. J. of Mathematics **64** (1942), 313–319.
- [6] T. KOTNIK AND J. VAN DE LUNE *On the order of the Mertens function*, Experimental Mathematics **13**:4 (2004), 473–481.
- [7] T. KOTNIK AND H. J. J. TE RIELE *The Mertens conjecture revisited*, Proc. ANTS 2006, Lecture Notes in Computer Science **4076** (2006), 156–167.
- [8] R. S. LEHMAN, *On Liouville's function*, Math. Comp. **14** (1960), 311–320.
- [9] D. H. LEHMER, *Extended computation of the Riemann zeta function*, Mathematika **3** (1956), 102–108.
- [10] E. D. F. MEISSEL, *Berechnung der Menge von Primzahlen, welche innerhalb der ersten Milliarde natürlicher Zahlen vorkommen*, Math. Ann. **25** (1885), 251–257.
- [11] A. M. ODLYZKO AND H. J. J. TE RIELE, *Disproof of the Mertens conjecture*, J. für die reine und angewandte Mathematik **357** (1985), 138–160.
- [12] G. PÓLYA, *Verschiedene Bemerkungen zur Zahlentheorie*, Jahresbericht der deutschen Math.-Vereinigung **28** (1919), 31–40.
- [13] M. RUBINSTEIN AND P. SARNAK, *Chebyshev's bias*, Experimental Mathematics **3** (1994), 173–197.
- [14] M. TANAKA, *A numerical investigation on cumulative sum of the Liouville function*, Tokyo J. Math. **3** (1980), 187–189.

MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES INSTITUTE, AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY,
CANBERRA, ACT 0200, AUSTRALIA
E-mail address: polya@rpbrent.com

LANGEBUORREN 49, 9074 CH HALLUM, THE NETHERLANDS
(FORMERLY AT CWI, AMSTERDAM)
E-mail address: j.vandelune@hccnet.nl